

REMARKS

No amendments have been made. Claims 1-18 and 20-36 remain pending in the application.

In the office action mailed 02/07/2008, claims 11-18, 20-29, and 34-36 were allowed, and claims 4-8 and 32 were objected to.

In the office action mailed 02/07/2008, claims 1-3, 9-10, 30, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 7,225,276 (Garrett). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 specifies a cell within a system, storing configuration data for the system in a cell, and also storing in the cell an identifier that uniquely identifies the system to which the configuration data corresponds. Garrett does not teach or suggest storing an identifier that uniquely identifies the system. Garrett teaches a cartridge (CSSP) that may contain multiple Field Replaceable Units (FRU's). Garrett teaches that each FRU includes configuration data for the CSSP, and one or more identifiers for the FRU (that is, an FRU-ID, but not an identifier for the system or CSSP) (for example, column 32, lines 49-63) but there is no teaching or suggestion for an identifier that uniquely identifies the system (CSSP) to which configuration data corresponds.

Claim 30 specifies cells within a multi-cell system where cells store an identifier that uniquely identifies a multi-cell partition to which stored configuration data corresponds. Garrett does not teach or suggest an identifier that uniquely identifies a multi-cell partition to which configuration data corresponds. As discussed in conjunction with claim 1, Garrett at column 32, lines 49-63 discusses FRU-ID's, but does not teach or suggest multi-cell partitions, or an identifier that uniquely identifies a multi-cell partition to which configuration data corresponds.

Accordingly, applicant asserts that Garrett does not teach every limitation of independent claims 1 and 30. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of claims 1 and 30.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and inherit every limitation therefrom. Claims 31-33 depend from claim 30 and inherit every limitation therefrom. As shown above,

Garrett fails to teach every limitation of claims 1 and 30. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of record for claims 2-10 and 31-33.

In the office action mailed 02/07/2008, claims 1-3, 9-10, 30, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,961,761 (Masuyama). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 specifies a cell within a system, storing configuration data for the system in a cell, and also storing in the cell an identifier that uniquely identifies the system to which the configuration data corresponds.

In the present application, paragraph [0024], prior art systems are discussed in which configuration data is managed by a processor that is external to each of the partitions. Masuyama teaches an example of such a system, in which configuration data is managed by an external server manager. From the present application, paragraph [0017], cells are also known as nodes. Masuyama teaches prior art (figure 1) and new (figure 2) partitioned multi-node systems in which partition information is stored at the system level (column 1, lines 25-34). That is, partition definition registers (also called domain configuration registers) 125 are shared by all partitions. Masuyama does not teach or suggest that system configuration data is stored locally in nodes, or that nodes store an identifier that uniquely identifies the system to which the configuration data corresponds. Note at column 3, lines 35-38, lines 47-50, and lines 61-62, that only the external server manager can read and write to the domain configuration registers. From column 4, line 40 through column 5, line 4, memory is mapped into windows, with each domain having its own window of local domain addresses (405). Masuyama teaches that each window of addresses has an identifier, but Masuyama does not teach or suggest an identifier that uniquely identifies the system to which configuration data corresponds.

Claim 30 specifies cells within a multi-cell system where cells Claim 30 specifies cells within a multi-cell system where cells store an identifier that uniquely identifies a multi-cell partition to which stored configuration data corresponds. As discussed in

conjunction with claim 1, Masuyama does not teach or suggest an identifier that uniquely indentifies a multi-cell partition to which stored configuration data corresponds.

Accordingly, applicant asserts that Masuyama does not teach every limitation of independent claims 1 and 30. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of claims 1 and 30.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and inherit every limitation therefrom. Claims 31-33 depend from claim 30 and inherit every limitation therefrom. As shown above, Masuyama fails to teach every limitation of claims 1 and 30. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of record for claims 2-10 and 31-33.

Respectfully submitted,
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

By: /Augustus W. Winfield/

Augustus W. Winfield, Reg. No. 34046
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: (303) 298-9888

Date: May 7, 2008